12/17/69

To Harold and Dick:

(To Harold--I am enclosing the memo I did on the CE 562 and 564 thing which I believe Dick has told you about. There is really little more detail I can add to the background.)

I thank Dick for his praise on the memo. So far I have been unable to find individual markings on the pictures which would be positive proof of one negative. Most of the markings come from copying or developing. However I detailed my thoughts on the dilemma of duplicating the circumstances and that is pretty much the limit of my certainty. As for the half "figure eights" to which Dick refers in a letter of 12/8, I have given much thought to them. I don't recall whether I mentioned this in the memo but the first thing I did when I saw those marks was to check the other Frazier exhibits for same--I found none other than these two. If he used the same microscope for all his exhibits, then these would have to appear on the others. However, he could have changed microscopes. I myself doubt if these can be associated with lens damage or that sort of thing because 1) any half decent microscope will not have such things on its lenses or if it did in a crime lab, it would (or should) immediately be replaced for it could interfere with the integrity of the exhibits it produces, and 2) that would represent an extremely small area on the microscope for such damage to occur if concentric arcs can ever occur like that in glass(optical glass). I can say from what I recall that the patterns of the arcs were identical although they fell on different places in each picture. Also, in one, 564 I believe, there is more area of rings exposed than in the other. Oh, this reminds me, if these comparison microscopes have a set field(i.e. their midline when the two images are integrated cannot be changed) then these lines are proof of fakery since the patterns of lines should be identical in the two pictures with the <u>same amount</u> exposed. I don't know how much the lenses can be moved around.

Thanks to Dick for his comments on my Frazier notes. Have I sent Harold a copy? I'm enclosing a copy of my Finck notes which both of you can keep. I hope you find them interesting. There is little time now and little need for me to add to them here.

When I read Dick's 12/9 letter to Harold and saw that the Archives said it "lost" the negative for Haorld's 399 base photo, I nearly fell over. I'd like a copy of the Archives letter since I myself have recently ordered the same picture. I'm sure that Harold must have had a similar reaction especially in light of what we saw. I told this to my father who at first didn't think much of it. "Well, they can just take the same picture over again," he said. Ah, it cannot! If Harold wants me to make a negative from his picture, I will or he can take it to someone and probably have it done better. He should do one or the other so he can at least circualte the picture--it's qutie important.

Still,

Vincent